

LTYSM
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Atty. Docket

CHRISTOPH G.A. HOELEN ET AL.

NL 000211

APR 19 2004

OFFICIAL

Serial No. 09/837,937

Group Art Unit: 2675

Filed: April 19, 2001

Examiner: Uchendu O. Anyaso

Title: ASSEMBLY OF A DISPLAY DEVICE AND AN ILLUMINATION SYSTEM

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I certify that this correspondence is being:

☐ deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.☒ 2 pages transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at 703-872-9306On: April 19, 2004By: Chessa De LuceyAMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated 10 March 2004, in the above-identified patent application, attorney for Applicants respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, 14, 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nobs (US Patent 4,559,480) in view of Havel (US Patent 6,535,186).

Each of these claims recites an assembly comprising at least:

- a display device with a pattern of pixels driven by a control

circuit; and


- an illumination system for providing light to the display device, wherein the illumination system comprises LEDs having different light-emitting wavelengths and driven by the control circuit in dependence on an image to be displayed by the display device.

In Nobs, the fluorescent light emitting elements are themselves the pixels (column 3, lines 33-36) driven by the circuit of Figure 7. There is no separate illumination system for providing light to the pixels in dependence on the image to be displayed, as is claimed by Applicants.

The citation of the additional patents to Streck and Gibbons in rejecting dependent claims 3, 4, 7, 12, 13 and 16 do not overcome the deficiencies in the rejection of the independent claims based on Nobs and Havel.

Reconsideration of the Final Rejection in view of the above comments and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Robert J. Kraus, Reg. 26,358
Attorney
(914) 333-9634
April 19, 2004